

JAN 19 1917
UNIV. OF MICH.
LIBRARY

The Classical Weekly

VOL. X

MONDAY, JANUARY 15, 1917

No. 12

The Classical Association of the Atlantic States

Members of this Association may, by subscribing through its Secretary-Treasurer, secure certain periodicals at much less than the regular rates. These periodicals are

I. THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL \$1.00

*9 numbers per year. Appeals to teachers in Schools and Colleges,
especially Schools*

Regular price, to all not members of The Classical Association of the Middle West and South, \$2.50 (recently increased from \$1.50).

II. CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY \$1.67

A quarterly Journal, devoted to research in all Classical Fields

Regular price, to all not members of The Classical Association of the Middle West and South, \$3.00.

III. ART and ARCHAEOLOGY, for 1917, \$2.40

*A popular, illustrated Monthly Magazine, published by The
Archaeological Institute of America*

From October 1, 1916, to December 31, 1917 - - - - \$3.00
Regular rates, respectively \$3.00 and \$4.50

Subscriptions at these rates, by members of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States only, may be made to Charles Knapp, Barnard College, New York City. They must in all cases be accompanied by remittance.

For further information about The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, and THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, its organ, see first column of page iv of this issue.

Pearson's Essentials of Latin for Beginners

Revised Edition. By HENRY C. PEARSON, Principal, Horace Mann
Elementary School, Teachers College, Columbia University

THE trend of Latin teaching to-day in Secondary Schools is toward the reading of a greater amount of easy, connected Latin during the first year. For this purpose, *Pearson's Essentials of Latin* is better equipped than any other book. Its selections for sight reading are graded and are specified for use after every third Lesson. These selections are really interesting stories, readable, human, sometimes humorous.

Pearson's Essentials of Latin has had a striking success because it prepares pupils in a thorough fashion to read Caesar, and at the same time lays a solid foundation for all subsequent work in Latin.

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON

ATLANTA

Suggestions for Reading at Sight From BICE'S SIGHT READING IN LATIN

First read each sentence through slowly and thoughtfully, aloud if possible, trying to decide, when each word is reached, what its form is or may be.

Read it once more, trying to see how the words are related to one another.

After this, another reading will usually show the relation which the groups of words have to one another and to the main statement.

This is an abridgment of the Introduction to Bice's SIGHT READING IN LATIN. The book consists of a series of selections from many sources, with just the right amount of help for the pupil.

A practical, helpful, and inviting book. It costs fifty cents.

GINN AND COMPANY

70 Fifth Avenue

NEW YORK

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 1, 1879

VOL. X

NEW YORK, JANUARY 15, 1917

No. 12

(Continued from page 82)

If, then, the metrical form is of such fundamental importance it goes without saying that study of meter should form an important part of the study of poetry. This statement means that the High School teacher who fails to devote an adequate portion of time, energy and skill to the presentation to his class of the metrical form of Vergil is coming far short of a proper discharge of his duties. I am not now concerned with the various pleas in extenuation which such High School teacher may urge. If the fault lies in the curriculum rather than in himself, then there should be agitation for the reform of the curriculum. If the fault lies in improper methods of introducing the pupil into the study of Latin—in the failure, I mean, to train the pupil in right pronunciation of Latin words, with consequent knowledge of quantities—, then there should be agitation for reform in the methods of teaching the elements of Latin. On one point Insist: the teacher should subject himself to vigorous self-examination, to determine whether, after all, the fault is not in himself, rather than in the curriculum or in the methods of teaching adopted by those in whose charge the pupil was in earlier days. He should appreciate first of all the importance of a knowledge of the metrical form, he should set about possessing such a knowledge for himself, and then by every means within his power he should develop in his pupils as far as possible a like knowledge.

In this connection the High School teacher has not only a great opportunity, that of introducing the student into an important and fascinating study, but also a deep responsibility. It is on the foundation laid by the High School teacher that the College instructor is obliged to attempt to rear a superstructure. If pupils come to him with a fair knowledge of Latin prosody, with some knowledge of the underlying theory of Greco-Roman versification, as seen in the hexameter, and with the power to read Vergil's verses in some way which shall give rhythmical effects (whether that way be the way in which Vergil himself read those verses or not), then the College instructor can pass on to consider with his students the meters of Horace (meters commonly regarded by freshmen as extremely hard, but in reality far easier than Vergil's, because they follow, verse after verse, a set scheme, and so lack the variety of Vergil's hexameters), and mayhap the more trying meters of Terence and Plautus,

the meters of Greek tragedy, even the choral meters. But, if the High School training, for any reason, fails to give the pupil a competent knowledge of the hexameter, then the College instructor may well despair of giving his students any acquaintance with the more intricate meters presented by the works of the authors commonly read in the College course.

If I were to stop at this point, I should be guilty of a weakness that marks many papers addressed to teachers, as it marks many sermons—they are strong on the homiletical side, but woefully lacking on the constructive side. How shall the objects this paper has in mind be accomplished? Logically, I should begin with the teacher, because, to utter another platitude, if the teacher does not read Latin verses well, if the teacher cannot 'scan', there is no hope that he will be able to teach his pupils to read Latin verses well, to 'scan'. But I begin rather with the pupil, because I can dispose of that subject by referring to what I have written on it in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 3-5, 10-12 (see also 46).

I turn now to the teacher's part in this matter. First and foremost I put, as a *sine qua non* of mastery of Latin and of decent teaching of Latin, the habit of reading Latin aloud. Read some Latin aloud every day. If one has yet to contract this habit, it will, of course, be wise to begin with some prose Latin that is familiar—for example, such an easy piece of Latin as the First or the Third Catilinarian Oration, or the De Senectute, or Livy 1, 21, or 22. It will soon become apparent that the long, periodic Latin sentence breaks up after all into groups of words, as a rule small in compass, as a rule intelligible enough in themselves, so that one can do easily, after a little practice, the one thing absolutely essential to the mastery of the Latin period—hold ideas in solution, safe from premature precipitation. Aid here can be got from the Introduction to the edition of Nepos's Lives by Isaac Flagg (B. H. Sanborn and Co., Boston, 1895), from the punctuation of the text in that book, and from the special pointing, to mark phrases, of Professor F. G. Moore's excellent *Porta Latina* (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 9. 151-152, 164-165).

What of quantities? This is a simple enough matter, if handled sanely. Insistence on 'hidden quantities', regarded some twenty years or so ago as the one thing necessary to salvation, has, happily, long since been relegated to what, to modify words of a former

teacher of mine, may be described as "the limbo of <pedagogical> curiosities". Necessary to the scholar this knowledge is; but in the Secondary Schools it has no place, save, perhaps, in the simple matter that the vowel before *nf* or *ns* is long by nature, or in such a familiar word as *contio*, where the etymology makes all plain. What remains need frighten no one—provided he has brains and is willing to use them for a little while. If one will master—and apply, every day, in his own private reading of Latin aloud, and in his class-room teaching—the rules for final syllables ending in *s*, and the 'exceptions' thereto that study and teaching of the declensions ought to make as familiar to one as the English alphabet is, if he will master—and apply—the rules for 'increment' in nouns and verbs, he will find that he can mark, correctly, in any Latin text, familiar or unfamiliar, the quantities of a very large percentage of the vowels. The quantity of the root vowel of a word must be memorized, but even here there are helps in plenty to the memory. Reading of earlier Latin or of the inscriptions will show such spellings, for instance, as *moerus*, *douco*, *deico*: if one notes such things, how can he be uncertain about the quantity of the *u* in *murus* and *duco*, of the *i* in *dico*? Derivation helps. If one connects *incido*, 'to cut into', with *caedo*, will he be uncertain about the quantity of the second *i* in this word?

What of reading Latin hexameters aloud? First of all let me make reference here to a very valuable discussion of the Latin hexameter, too little known to teachers of Latin. It is the chapter, labelled *Metre*, which Professor Kirby Smith contributed to the Introduction, pages lix–lxxii, of H. L. Wilson's edition of Juvenal (D. C. Heath and Co., 1903). Those who can read German—and this class should include every teacher of Latin—will find a wealth of additional matter in the works referred to by Professor Smith in his footnotes. For the teacher of Vergil a very valuable book is *The Metrical Licenses of Vergil*, by H. W. Johnston (Scott, Foresman and Co., Chicago, 1898).

(To be concluded)

REVIEWS

The Scholia on the Aves of Aristophanes. By John Williams White. Boston and London: Ginn and Co. (1914). Pp. cxii + 378. \$3.50.

Professor White has been a close student of Aristophanes for many years, as every classical scholar the world over knows. He had begun the study of the scholia of Aristophanes many years before the publication of the facsimile of the Venetus Manuscript (1902). In 1903, as he tells us in his Preface to the present volume, he was urged to publish what has since become this book. In three years the main body of the work (pages 1–303) was finished and electrotyped. The plates were "stored in the vaults of the Athenaeum Press", where they lay for about

eight years, for personal reasons. Fortunately for us all there were no 'worms of Scepis' there, to play havoc with his work.

In a short Preface the editor calls attention to the many difficulties involved in understanding and appreciating Aristophanes to-day, difficulties lying in the fact that the substance of comedy is essentially local and especially so in the case of the comedies of Aristophanes. He then states the main thesis of the long Introduction that follows, that comedy was studied profitably at Alexandria for five hundred years, "from just after the foundation of the city to the end of the second century after Christ", and that about two centuries later there was composed—probably in Constantinople—a variorum edition of Aristophanes. That Professor White is to be ranked among conservative editors in general is seen in his vigorous and picturesque characterization of the pernicious charm that emendation possesses for the scholar:

Emendation is the most fascinating and demoralizing diversion that the classical scholar has been vouchsafed by his peculiar gods.

In the case of scholia, however, he feels that more editorial freedom must be allowed, and that oftentimes the "scalpel is the only instrument of salvation".

The editor renders thanks to those that have helped him with advice and conjecture—Mr. Stephen Byington, Professors Henry Jackson, Henry Wright, Edward Capps, and Charles B. Gulick, and Dr. Earnest Cary. Special thanks are tendered to Professor Capps for preparing the Indexes, of which more anon.

In the Introduction, about seventy-five pages are devoted to an elaborate and detailed account of the early students and editors of Aristophanes and his scholia and of the progress of Aristophanic knowledge down through the ages until the time of our manuscripts of the works of Aristophanes and of his scholia. Then follow about eighteen pages that deal with the manuscripts that appear in Professor White's critical apparatus.

In the first part of the Introduction, then, we find an account of the foundation of Alexandria, and of the early Ptolemies; of the establishment and situation of the Museum; of the beginning and size of the Library; of Callimachus, Eratosthenes, Aristophanes, Callistratus, Aristarchus, Didymus, and the other great students of comedy. Then we read more particularly of the work done on Aristophanes: of Zenodotus, who assigned to Lycophron the classification of the comic poets for the catalogue that Aristarchus himself was preparing; of Lycophron's treatise on comedy, and of other treatises; of Euphronius, who was the first scholar to give special attention to Aristophanes in a continuous commentary. The value of our scholia may be noted in part from the fact that this Euphronius is referred to or quoted a dozen times in the scholia of the Aves, generally for the meaning of a word or phrase or sentence, occasionally for facts

about a person. Differences in text, due to careless scribes, to actors, and to owners, brought about the need of a text revision. This was undertaken by Aristophanes of Byzantium. He is referred to six times in the scholia of the Aves; these references are mainly for matters of text, *σημεία*, or ordinary commentary. Callistratus, too, wrote a commentary on Aristophanes; he is referred to seven times in the scholia of the Aves; his interests covered a wide range. The great Aristarchus also wrote a commentary on Aristophanes; he is referred to only once in the scholia of the Aves, but many times in the scholia of other plays, particularly the *Ranae*.

The first scholar to compose a variorum edition of the Greek classics was Didymus, who lived in the last part of the first century B.C. Among his editions of this sort was one of Aristophanes. The interests of Didymus were largely literary, historical, biographical, and antiquarian, rather than linguistic. A second variorum commentary of Aristophanes was made by Symmachus, who lived about a hundred years after Didymus. Some centuries later an anonymous scholar made another compilation of these commentaries.

At this point Professor White discusses rather fully the great fire at Alexandria at the time of Julius Caesar's visit to that city. He does not accept the view of Wilamowitz that the Library was totally destroyed, nor does he agree with Mahaffy that the story of the burning of the Library is a fabrication. After giving the evidence in full and sifting it he comes to the conclusion that the Library was seriously damaged by fire, but that it was not burned down; and that the damage had been repaired before Strabo's visit. The only weak point in his case is the argument from the silence of Strabo. He reasons that, inasmuch as Strabo makes no mention of the Library, his silence . . . is intelligible on the assumption that the Library may have been seriously damaged, but had not burnt down and had been repaired. He was in Alexandria as a traveller, not as a student; the unique organization of the Museum attracted his attention; but if the Library in its immediate vicinity and all its books had been totally destroyed, he could hardly have failed to record so lamentable a catastrophe. But, surely the silence of Strabo would seem natural, if, as Mahaffy believes, the Library was not burned at all. And there might have been some reason for his silence that we do not know, even had the Library been totally destroyed.

After discussing the fire, the editor goes back to Didymus. He shows that there is no evidence to support the view that Didymus lived and taught at Rome, though this is given as a fact in some modern works; a conjectural emendation, by Schmidt, of a passage in Suidas has given color to this wrong belief. Moreover, Alexandria, with the addition of books brought from the Pergamene collection, would have furnished Didymus with the necessary library for his work, whereas Rome could not have supplied it. Then follows a brief survey of scholars who were

contemporaries or successors of Didymus—Aristonicus, Tryphon, Antigonos, Theon, Apion, Seleucus, Pamphilus, Antiochus, Epaphroditus, Ptolemy Chennus, Irenaeus, Amarantus, Nicanor, Aelius Theon, Apollonius Dyscolus, and Herodian.

Then the editor takes up briefly the subject of metrical science, calling attention to the fact that there were two theories that prevailed in ancient times; one "is Alexandrian", the other "is attributed to Varro". The Alexandrian system, which recognized "certain fundamental elements of rhythmical measurement", was maintained, in Imperial times, by Philoxenus, Heliodorus, and Hephaestion. Professor White comes to the conclusion that possibly Aristophanes of Byzantium, who was, we know, a great student of metrics, formulated the metrical system as handed down to us by Heliodorus and Hephaestion.

Next the editor discusses the relation of Symmachus and Didymus to each other. He proves, what was almost unanimously maintained before, that Symmachus followed Didymus and was the second variorum editor of the scholia. The way in which Symmachus refers to Didymus and quotes him in the extant scholia of the Aves sufficiently proves this. Besides, the final editor of these scholia had access to the commentary of Symmachus (and presumably not to that of Didymus), as is shown by the subscription to the scholia of the Aves: 'this was written out of <ἐκ> the scholia of Symmachus and others'. The exact date of Symmachus can not be fixed. Professor White suggests 100 A.D. "as a probable working hypothesis". The name of Symmachus appears twenty times in the scholia of the Aves in connection with his views. In fifteen of these the name of Didymus and his opinion are given; in thirteen Symmachus differs from Didymus. This shows that Symmachus was independent in his ideas, and suggests that he was probably influenced to make his edition from the feeling that the edition of Didymus was inaccurate. His notes cover various subjects—accent, quantity, form of words, manuscript readings, matters of history, biography, etc.

Contrary to Wilamowitz and Susemihl Professor White maintains that the commentaries of Didymus and of Symmachus were "independent books, unaccompanied by the text but provided with lemmata". The evidence for this, which is given in detail and which, to the reviewer, seems absolutely conclusive, is the fact that no extant papyri of the third and second centuries before Christ, and perhaps none of the first century within the Alexandrine Age, show any exegetical commentary in connection with a text edition; of the papyri which, somewhat later in date, do have more or less in the way of scholia, none has anything like the relative amount of scholia that the works of Didymus and Symmachus would show; the fact, again, that extant remains down to the fourth century after Christ bear witness that only a few papyrus manuscripts of Greek authors were annotated in the

manner of early parchment and later paper manuscripts with which we are familiar, and that the scholia in these were relatively brief and meager.

The proof that they were separate works, unprovided with the text of the author but furnished with lemmata, is indubitable: remains are extant of papyri written in the first century before Christ and in each of the first four centuries of the Christian era which contain commentaries of this sort, on Homer preeminently, but also on Herodotus, Thucydides, Aristophanes, Plato, Demosthenes, Aristotle, and Callimachus. Each of these cases Professor White takes up in more or less detail. There are few traces of the separate commentary in the papyrus roll after the third century of the Christian era. Papyrus gave way to parchment in the course of time and the roll gave way to the codex. These changes promoted convenience and permanence. The parchment seems to have prevailed over the papyrus by the fourth century after Christ. These facts lead Professor White to the very plausible hypothesis that the archetype of all the extant manuscripts of Aristophanes was written in the fourth or the fifth century of the Christian era, that it was a parchment codex, and that it contained both the text of Aristophanes and the commentary or scholia. From the encouragement given to Greek scholarship at this time at Constantinople, and especially from the appreciation shown there for the comedies of Aristophanes, he infers that the work was done at Constantinople.

It is clear that this anonymous editor of this first parchment codex did not have before him the commentary of Didymus; for, if he had had it, he would have quoted from Didymus directly instead of quoting through the mediumship of Symmachus. Moreover, this editor acknowledges in his subscription that he had used Symmachus, but makes no mention of Didymus. Probably this editor did not have any of the older commentators—Euphronius, Aristophanes of Byzantium, Callimachus, Aristarchus, and Crates; else he would probably have noted that fact, as he noted the use of the commentary of Symmachus. It looks as if the notes ascribed to the scholars who immediately followed Didymus, namely Apion, Seleucus, and Epaphroditus, may well have been taken from them at first hand, instead of being taken from Symmachus's use of them. At any rate, the name of Symmachus is not linked with their names, in the commentary, as it is with the name of Didymus. In the subscription to the manuscript acknowledgment is made to 'others'. The scholars meant are probably those mentioned by name in the scholia who lived later than the time of Didymus—namely, Irenaeus, Apollonius Dyscolus, Herodian, Telephus, Phrynichus, Palamedes, Athenaeus, Sallustius, Phaeinus, and others whose names are not mentioned. To Phaeinus has sometimes been ascribed the credit of having written this parchment codex. Professor White disposes of this view very summarily by calling attention to "the despicable quality of the few notes

on a single play to which his name is attached" (the *Equites*), and by noting that Greek commentators do not name themselves thus formally in their own notes.

Evidence, found largely in the existing scholia themselves, shows that this parchment codex of Aristophanes contained at least our eleven plays, and had more abundant scholia than are found in any of our existing manuscripts. This last statement is proved by the wealth of material in Suidas that is not found in any of our scholia of Aristophanes. At some time this parchment codex, the archetype of all our complete manuscripts of Aristophanes, was lost, but not until a copy or copies of it had been made. With the revival of learning in the ninth century Aristophanes was studied again and, beginning with the next century, or a little later, manuscripts were written that have been saved to us. A comparison of these manuscripts shows such agreement in mistakes in the body of the text and such similarity in the scholia as to prove that they are all descended from one archetype; whereas papyrus fragments of manuscripts of the third, fourth, and fifth centuries show, in some respects, a different tradition.

The earliest and best full testimony for the text of Aristophanes and for commentary upon Aristophanes is found in the Codex Ravennas, of the last part of the tenth or the beginning of the eleventh century, and in the Codex Venetus. The Venetus is "the fullest and most trustworthy source of the old scholia of the seven comedies it contains". Suidas is also very valuable in giving us comments that are missing in the manuscripts of Aristophanes themselves. In the twelfth century there began, at the hands of Tzetzes, a contamination of the manuscripts of Aristophanes. He started in to 'improve' them. In the fourteenth century came two other commentators on Aristophanes—Thomas Magister and Demetrius Triclinius. Some of their notes have become imbedded in the later manuscripts.

There are fifteen manuscripts that contain all or nearly all of the *Aves*. Five of these have no scholia. The scholia of the other ten are given in the collation, in so far as the scholia are old. The newer scholia are given, in large part, in Supplementary Notes. There follows in the Introduction a brief statement of each codex used, with some account of the characteristics of its hand or hands, and an estimate of its value. This part of the Introduction ends with a description of the *editio princeps* of Musurus. This edition presented a good collection of scholia, though the sources of these scholia are not given, and in some instances are unknown even now.

The reviewer has given this long account of the Introduction for several reasons. In the first place, there is found in this treatise a lucid, full, and generally convincing account of the work done on Aristophanes by scholars from the earliest times down to the time of the printed edition. Secondly, we learn to appreciate the soundness of judgment of the editor, combined

with his accuracy of scholarship, so that we feel that we can depend upon him in the fields where we cannot follow him so closely. Besides, this Introduction can be read with great pleasure and profit by all, whereas the body of the work is for reference or class-room work.

As a kind of Appendix to the Introduction, though it is not thus designated in the book, comes a very detailed account of the manuscripts that have been collated, with a careful statement of their contents, the number of folios, position of scholia, etc., together with a bibliography of their study and investigation. The manuscripts thus described are: Venetus CCCCLXXIV (V), Venetus CCCCLXXV (G), Ravennas 137, 4, A (R), Laurentianus XXXI 15 (Γ), Leidensis 52 (Γ: originally part of the preceding), Estensis III D 8 (E), Ambrosianus L 39 sup. (M), Urbinas 141 (U), Parisinus 2717 (C: this has only a few scholia and glosses and is given in the Supplementary Notes, and not in the main collation), Ambrosianus L 41 sup. (M 9: this has scholia of no independent value, as they are rewritings of the notes in Codex E; samples of these scholia are given in the pages immediately following the Supplementary Notes), Estensis III D 14 (E 2: the scholia in this manuscript have no independent value; they are printed in the pages immediately following those devoted to the manuscript just preceding). To these are added the Editio Princeps (P).

While the Introduction is the most valuable part of the book for the general reader and for the uncritical student of Aristophanes, it is, of course, the edition of the scholia themselves, which includes a transcript of the Venetus manuscript, and a collation of all the important manuscripts of these scholia, and the critical notes that make this book important. Just here, however, the ordinary reviewer finds himself at a great disadvantage. To give an accurate and valuable opinion as to the precise worth of this edition would involve a repetition of most of the vast amount of work done by the editor himself; it would mean a comparison of the transcript of the Venetus with the facsimile of the manuscript itself, and also a collation of the manuscripts that have been used in the collation itself. This the reviewer has neither the ability nor the time to do. He feels, however, that he may speak with some weight, for he has read through all the transcript, all the critical notes, and all the final text. The accuracy manifest in the part he has read gives assurance of the accuracy, at least in general, of the part that he has not read.

In his Conjectural Readings now first Proposed of the Text of the Scholia on the Aves (civ-cx) the editor enumerates about two hundred and thirty readings. Most of these are his own. About thirty suggestions or conjectures are ascribed to Professor Capps, about a dozen each to Professors Wright and Jackson, and a few each to Professor Gulick, Dr. Cary, and Mr. Byington. One might be inclined to

suspect, from this rather long list, that Professor White had been obliged to apply the "scalpel" often, as "the only instrument of salvation". However, investigation shows that the scalpel is not used so very often, after all. Some of the conjectural readings offered by the editor himself are not accepted in the text: e.g. in the first argument, *τούτου*, conjectured for the manuscript reading *τούδε τοῦ* (*τούδε*); in the third argument, *πέτραις*, conjectured for the manuscript reading *Ἀθήναις* (this conjecture receives weight from the fact that in the preceding argument *πέτραις* is read in the manuscript); on verse 11, *γινώσκοντα*, conjectured for the manuscript reading *γινώσκειν*; on verse 43, *ταῦτα*, conjectured for the manuscript reading *αὐτά*; etc. Some of the readings given in the list of conjectures offered by the cooperating scholars are really, as the editor himself states, the manuscript readings, which had been rejected by editors, but are now offered again, with a different punctuation or with a new suggestion as to a word to be supplied. One of these, at least, is accepted by the editor: on verse 66, *καὶ μὴν ἐρώτα*: *τὰ πρὸς πόδων' σαφέστερα* (Jackson). Two are not accepted by the editor: on verse 11, Professor Wright would keep the manuscript reading, *ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἕτερος*, believing that *στίχος* or *τόπος* is to be supplied (Professor White reads here in the text his own emendation, *ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἕτερος*, which is approximately the emendation of Bergk); on verse 807 Jackson would read, with the manuscripts, *ὡς δ' ἔστι*, and then punctuate with a comma after *πτερώματος* (here, Professor White accepts the reading of Suidas, *ὅδ' ἔστι*).

Many of the changes are slight and relatively unimportant: e.g. on verse 63 Professor White reads *οὕτως τι* (here the Venetus has *οὕτωσι τι*, while R has *οὕτωσι τί*, and E has *οὕτω'στι*, and Γ has *τέ οὐ* for *τι*); on verse 701 Professor White reads *τῆς* for the manuscript reading *τῆς*.

The question may well be asked at this time, What is the value of this new edition? Several values are to be assigned to it. First and foremost, whether this proves to be, to all intents and purposes, a final edition of the scholia of the Aves or not—and it is hard to decide with accuracy when a final edition of any work has been made—it certainly offers practically all the known material for making such an edition and would be itself a worthy final edition. In the next place, it offers the first complete and authoritative transcript of the Venetus Manuscript. Dindorf's edition claimed to give all the variant readings of the Venetus as well as of the Ravennas. It is manifest now, however, that Dindorf did not give, with any very great accuracy, an account of the readings of the Venetus. Finally, by this edition Professor White has cleared up many difficulties in the reading and the interpretation of the scholia.

Let me amplify a little the points just made. In the first place, taking the Venetus as his basis, Professor

White has given the variants in MSS G, R, A, Γ, E, M, U, and the Editio Princeps, besides adding, under the title of Supplementary Notes, even the more recent comments in MSS Γ, E, M, U, C, and the Editio Princeps, a Transcript of the Notes in E 9, and a Transcript of the notes on six folios in M 9. He has also given the variant readings of A and Pal 67 (Vp2) for the introductory matter contained in the scholia (these manuscripts have no scholia on the body of the Aves itself). To these statements might be added the fact that much information has been brought to bear on the form and interpretation of the text from Suidas primarily, and to some extent from the other lexicographers. In the second place, the inaccuracy of former editions in their references to the readings of the Venetus is seen from various statements by Professor White. In his comments on the Second Argument he says,

This argument is read in V (G) E and the Princeps. Statements that it is late (Dindorf, Blaydes) and that it is not read in V (Dübner, Blaydes, Hall and Geldart, van Leeuwen) require correction. Brunck and Bekker admit it.

In the Third Argument appears this reading, ἔστι δὲ λέ. Again the editor says,

the statement that this phrase is not found in V (Dindorf, Dübner, Blaydes, Hall and Geldart, van Leeuwen) requires correction.

To this may be added the remark made on the scholium on verse 303,

The help Küster desired seems to be furnished by V, which has These readings were overlooked by Dindorf and his copyist Dübner.

In the next place, let the reviewer note, in the order of their appearance, a few of the important points in which Professor White has helped in text and elucidation. The editor, be it noted first, has drawn freely from Suidas, as he himself states, often amplifying existing commentary by material furnished by Suidas, and sometimes introducing whole notes, the authority for which is Suidas alone.

The editor keeps (page 8) the manuscript reading in the Fourth Argument, *ὡς εἰ πεποιθὼν ἕτερος τῷ ἑτέρῳ καὶ ἐλπίζοι ἔσεσθαι ἐν βελτίοσι*, and considers that "Both names are interpreted from the point of view of Euelpides. To say that Euelpides 'relies on' (*πέθοιδα*) Peithetaerus is a mode of expressing the converse fact that Peithetaerus 'wins over' (*πέθειν*) his comrade Euelpides". So he gives the name of the character throughout the scholia as *Πειθέταιρος* and not as *Πεισθέταιρος*, as the manuscripts and editors have regularly done. Both Meineke and Rutherford, who amend the passage, think that *ἕτερος* refers to *Pei(s)-thetaerus*; in fact, Rutherford makes the reading *<Πεισθ>έταιρος*. In the commentary on *ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ χωρᾷ*, a part of the scholium on verse 395, the editor calls attention to a mistake in Curtius (*Stadtgeschichte von Athen*, 120), who cites this passage "in sole support of his view that there was a sec-

tion in the Ceramicus in which those were buried who had fallen in Attica". With the help of Suidas and others, the editor is enabled to amend the scholium on verse 767 so as to make it intelligible. In the comment on the scholium of verse 1113, where the editors all read *πρόλοβος*, Professor White keeps the reading of the manuscripts, *πρόλογος*, which is substantiated by the reading in the Fayûm Fragment. In the last part of a scholium on the same verse the editor makes a restoration on the authority of the same Fayûm Fragment. In his comment on the scholium of verse 1150 the editor explains the scholium, and then calls attention to the fact that Rutherford first "restores the note, so that it reads . . . and then condemns <his own restoration> as nonsense". In his note on the scholium on verse 1293 the editor suggests that *χελιδών*, "along with its varied other applications, may have signified also the *brand* of a horse,—the 'swallow brand'". In his note on the scholium on verse 1367 the editor calls attention to the fact that Rutherford misunderstood the meaning, when he translated the scholium by "They <the Athenians> are paid for military service at a higher rate than any other state". The scholium, which Professor White does not translate, evidently means 'for pay they serve as soldiers to help other states'. In the scholium on verse 1395 the editor accepts the emendation of Professor Capps, which makes a hard passage now intelligible.

There are several matters, however, that the reviewer would like to query. In the scholium on verse 121 why not accept the proposed emendation of Professor Capps, *Πυλαίη ἀρχή*? it would account for the reading in the manuscripts (*Πυλαιάρχῳ* in V, *Πυλαιάρχο* in G), and, as the editor notes, would be paralleled by the phrase in the scholium on verse, 275, *ἐκ <τῆς> Σοφοκλέους δευτέρας τυροῦς ἀρχῆς*. Probably the editor is influenced by the reading in Suidas, *Πυλαιαν*. In the scholium on verse 448 why should not the lemma be *ἀκούετε λεψ' τοῦς ὀπλίτας νυνμενί* or else why should not a new lemma, *νυνμενί*, be given for the last part of the scholium, which explains this phrase? In the scholium on verse 648 why should not *πάλιν* be added to the lemma, or a new lemma given consisting of that word? In the scholium on verse 701 why not keep *τάς* instead of emending to *τῆς*, so long as the manuscripts have *τάς* and the editor himself admits that it "may be right"? In verse 709 why not follow V in reading *τὸ 'Ἡσιόδειον*, as in the next lemma, instead of following the other manuscripts in reading *τὰ 'Ἡσιόδου*? In his note on the scholium on verse 719, where he changes *οἰωνοῦς* to *ὄρνις*, against the authority of the manuscripts and Suidas, the editor is not convincing. In the scholium on verse 1522 why not keep the reading of the manuscripts, *πολεμεῖν* (with *ἔφασαν*), instead of substituting *πολεμήσειν*, as the editor himself admits that the manuscript reading "may be right"?

In accuracy, so far as the reviewer has been able to determine, this is the best printed book that has come under his eye for careful reading. The misprints are almost negligible.

There is left for the reviewer the subject of the three Indexes: I. Greek Words (327-344); II. Subjects treated in the Introduction, Arguments, Scholia, and Notes (345-373); III. Greek Authors cited in the Arguments and Scholia on the Aves (375-378). In Appendix I are included glosses, the technical language of critics and grammarians, new words, words in new or unusual meanings, and—"so far as practicable"—syntax. The proof of an Index is in the using, and the reviewer does not pretend that he has used these Indexes fully. He has read them through, however, and he has tested them fairly carefully for the matter in the Introduction. As a result, he finds the following facts and makes the following queries. The basis for the inclusion or exclusion of a name or a fact has been hard to ascertain. Certain names or facts about those names, that appear in the Introduction, are not seen in the Indexes where one might expect to find them—e.g. Tzetzes, page xxx; Calvisius, *ibid.*; Varro, xxxii; Serapeum, xxxiii; Ptolemy Epiphanes and Ptolemy Philometor, xxxviii; Didymus the Younger, xxxix; Timotheus, xlix; Paeon of Isyllus, xlix, footnote 3; Seleucus, 1, footnote 4; commentaries on Aristarchus, lviii; scholia Didymi of Homer, lx, is given under Homer but not under Didymus; Didymus, lxx; Photius and Arethas, lxxii; Porphyrogenitus, lxxiii. This list does not claim to be complete. Very likely these names or references were omitted through the application of some fixed principle. If so, that principle might well have been stated. Or the indexer might say that, to keep the Indexes down to reasonable limits, he was obliged to omit some references, following his own best judgment. In that case one might go back over the list just given, and maintain that the judgment had not been unerring. But whose judgment is unerring?

Occasionally there is a difference in treatment in the Index of words or subjects that are brought together in the Introduction. So, in the Introduction, lvii, the author says,

Each of the remaining annotated papyri of the second century contains, as (*sic*) in general, only a few brief marginal notes. There are fragments of the Meliambi of Cercidas; of Sophocles's Ichneutae and Eurypylus, on which the brief annotation is mainly textual . . .

In the Index we read under Sophocles, page 372, "marginal notes in an early papyrus MS. of the Ichneutae and Eurypylus lvii"; whereas we read under Cercidas, page 351, "marginal notes in an early papyrus MS. of lvii". Here there is no reference to the nature of the work, the Meliambi. Perhaps this difference of treatment was accorded because of the more definite name of the works of Sophocles and an indication merely of the character of the works of Cercidas.

In the Introduction, lxvii, we find this sentence,

As to the scholars named in our scholia who followed Didymus in the first century, Apion, Seleucus, and Epaphroditus, it is quite as probable that the notes which are here ascribed to them were drawn by the anonymous editor directly from their works as that Symmachus furnished the quotations . . .

In the Index, page 346, under Apion, we read "may have been used directly by the compiler of the first parchment codex of Ar. lxvii"; likewise on page 372, under Seleucus, we read, "may have been used directly by the compiler of the first parchment codex of Ar. lxvii". But on page 356, under Epaphroditus, we read, "may have been used directly, *not through the medium of Symmachus*, by the compiler of the first parchment edition of Ar. lxvii, l. n. 4".

Sometimes the statement in the Index discloses the fact that it was not prepared by the author of the Introduction himself. So, on page xxii of the Introduction occur these words,

. . . Artemidorus of Tarsus, in the first century before Christ, compiled a lexicon that seems to have been *confined* to comedy¹.

In Index II, page 348, we have ". . . Artemidorus of Tarsus, author of a lexicon that *dealt largely* with comedy xxii"¹. Again, on page xxviii the author cites the scholium of Didymus on verse 149 as topographical. In Index III, page 376, we read, "Didymus, notes on the Aves: grammar and etymology 58, 149, 1121, 1283". On page xlix the editor says,

It is *possible* that Aristophanes formulated the metrical system of which the chief exponents for us are now Heliodorus and Hephaestion . . ."¹

On page 348, in the Index, we read, under the name of Aristophanes of Byzantium, these words, "*probably* the formulator of the A' Alexandrian metrical system of Heliodorus and Hephaestion xlix"¹. These are, of course, only slight flaws. Still, we have here a slight lack of what we might call 'good team work'.

Still, these very valuable Indexes show in every page and column the scholarship of a man who knows his Greek literature and who can thread his way through the maze of difficulties that abound in the scholia of Aristophanes.

Taking it all in all the reviewer doubts if a book more creditable to the best American classical scholarship has ever appeared. Long life to the able editor to continue—and to finish—the great work that he is doing for a better understanding of the Greek Classics in general and of Aristophanes in particular! This is the heartfelt wish of the reviewer, who desires, at this time, to pay his tribute of affection and respect to his *magister* of aforetime, through whom he got his first glimpse of the real power of the great comic poet.

WILLIAMS COLLEGE.

GEORGE EDWIN HOWES.

¹The Italics are the reviewer's.

Public Libraries and Literary Culture in Ancient Rome. By Clarence Eugene Boyd. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press (1915). Pp. 77. \$1.00.

Professor Boyd discusses the literary, inscriptional, and monumental data concerning public libraries at Rome in the first four centuries of the Empire, with special reference to the first one hundred and fifty years of that period. He considers the libraries from six points of view: their history, their equipment, their contents, their management, their object, and their cultural significance. The discussion is in what may be called 'thesis' form and gives an orderly presentation of the subject.

Of the twenty-eight public libraries which flourished in Rome in the fourth century of the Empire, only nine can be identified in name, and but seven in location. The nine are¹ (1) Bibliotheca in Atrio Libertatis; (2) B. Templi Apollinis; (3) B. Porticus Octaviae; (4) B. Templi Augusti; (5) B. Domus Tiberianae; (6) B. in Templo Pacis; (7) B. in Foro Traiani; (8) B. in Capitolio; (9) B. in Templo Aesculapii.

In the matter of library organization the Romans were naturally influenced by the systems of Assyria, Alexandria, and Pergamum; but they also in certain ways made advances on these systems. Study of the evidence concerning Roman libraries, and comparison with the libraries of Nineveh, Alexandria¹, and Pergamum, indicate that the Romans observed the following usages:

a) The library was regularly placed in proximity to a temple or palace, a patron god or deified hero being consequently associated with it. b) In the group of structures an eastern location was preferable for the library. c) The interior of the library was adorned in an artistic manner. d) Systematic methods were employed in the management of the library.

Interior ornamentation and systematic arrangement are two phases which show Roman advance over the Eastern prototypes.

As regards the contents of the libraries, while it is not clear to what extent specialization entered into the formation of these collections, it is reasonable to suppose that certain subjects or certain kinds of books were better represented in one library than in another. Thus, we note that the Library in Trajan's Forum was especially rich in books of reference. Taken together, the libraries offered the public a wide range of works for reading and study. There were books in Latin and books in Greek, books ancient and books modern, books poetic and books prosaic, literary books and scientific books. Law, history, biography, oratory, private documents (including historical data and imperial correspondence), public documents (including edicts, decrees, public acts, treaties, state records, etc.) were among the subjects represented. We should have been glad to know, if Professor Boyd

could have told us, how the public appreciated the facilities offered to it. By whom were the libraries used and to what extent were they used?

Professor Boyd notes that information about the duties of various library officials and the details of library organization is gleaned from inscriptions, while facts, few in number, concerning the personality of certain librarians are derived from literary notices. Anything further that we may say about the personnel of library administration is chiefly matter of inference. *Procurator, a bibliotheca, vilicus a bibliotheca, librarius, librarius a manu* are some of the terms discussed in this section; Asinius Pollio, Pompeius Macer, C. Iulius Hyginus, and Gaius Melissus are among the personalities of whom mention is made. "All data that survive warrant the conclusion that intellectuality, literary training, and professional efficiency were characteristics demanded of the several grades of administrators and attachés in the public libraries", is the sufficiently conservative inference drawn as to the personnel of the library staff.

The reasons for maintaining public libraries in ancient Rome were, according to Professor Boyd, three: the preservation of books and records, the instruction of the public (by reading in the library, reference and research, and withdrawal of books), and cultural influences (as indicated by the location of the libraries, their adornment, and their use as centers for social, literary, and political gatherings).

Under the heading Literary Culture of the Early Empire brief mention is made of such cultural influences as schools, bookshops, public baths, and literary circles.

Professor Boyd concludes that the value of public libraries in the life of Rome has been greatly underestimated. In summing up, he says:

... they were a powerful reflector of Rome's literary ideals; they assisted very appreciably in furthering the literary interests of the Empire; they were directly serviceable in furnishing material for both cultural improvement and research.

The book is provided with a Bibliography and an Index.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

J. W. H. WALDEN.

IMPORTANT ANNOUNCEMENT

The Eleventh Annual Meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States and the Tenth Annual Meeting of The Classical Association of Pittsburgh and Vicinity will be held together, at the University of Pittsburgh, on Friday and Saturday, April 27-28 next.

Details of the programme of this meeting are rapidly taking shape.

The Classical Association of the Atlantic States has never met further west than Philadelphia. Here is an opportunity for the members to show their interest in the Association, and at the same time to visit an interesting city.

CHARLES KNAPP, Secretary.

¹Why, by the way, is the erection of the library in the Serapeum assigned to a time after the destruction of the big library?

Back Volumes of The Classical Weekly
May Still be Obtained

\$1.00 Per Volume

ADDRESS:

CHARLES KNAPP

Barnard College New York City

W. F. HUMPHREY

300-312 Pulteney St. GENEVA, N. Y.

BOOK, CATALOG, MAGAZINE
AND BOOKLET PRINTING

*Special attention given to technical and
scientific publications and pamphlets*

THE COMPLETE PLANT
ESTABLISHED 1885

**LIVY: BOOKS I, XXI and
XXII.**

Revised Edition. By EMORY B. LEASE, College of
the City of New York. Cloth. xl+352 pages.
Price, \$1.25.

THE new edition has briefer notes, presented in a simpler form and at the same time in the light of the most recent investigations. Several new and valuable features of literary and historical interest have been added, and the new grammatical nomenclature, recommended by The American Philological Association, and The Modern Language Association, has been introduced. In addition to the three books (i, xxi and xxii) which are universally considered the best of those extant, summaries of the remaining books, with particular attention given to finer passages, have been included. It is believed that a mastery of the contents of this book will enable the student to acquire a broader and better knowledge of Livy and his History and to gain a better foundation for his subsequent study than can otherwise be secured.

D. C. HEATH & COMPANY

Boston

New York

Chicago

**READING
LATIN LITERATURE**

Experience shows that notes at the foot of the study page encourage the High School student to do better work.

Notes at the foot of the study page are found exclusively in

WALKER'S CAESAR
SCOTT & BEESON'S SECOND
LATIN BOOK

JOHNSTON & KINGERY'S CICERO
KNAPP'S VERGIL

Separate paper-covered texts
for class use free

SCOTT, FORESMAN & CO.

Publishers of the LAKE LATIN SERIES

NEW YORK

8-12 East 34th St.

**The Relation of Latin
to Practical Life**

A Manual for making an Exhibit to show in concrete form the practical value of the study of Latin

Price \$1.55

Postage 12 cents

Published by

FRANCES E. SABIN

419 Sterling Place

Madison, Wis.

GRAPHIC LATIN

A graphic representation of the main principles of the entire Latin language descriptively outlined from the standpoint of its eight parts of speech and conveniently arranged on four charts for study and use in the class-room.

Chart I. The Noun

Chart III. The Verb

Chart II. { The Adjective
The Adverb

Chart IV. { The Pronoun
The Preposition
The Conjunction
The Interjection

Complete set of four charts, bound in a ten-page pamphlet of heavy, durable, white paper (size 9 x 14 in.), per set..... \$.25
Single charts (size 18 x 14 in.), each \$.10

POSTAGE PREPAID

Address: JOHN C. GREEN, Jr., Blair Academy, Blairstown, N. J.

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is published by The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, weekly, on Mondays from October 1 to May 31 inclusive, except in weeks in which there is a legal or school holiday, at Barnard College, Broadway and 120th St., New York City.

All persons within the territory of the Association who are interested in the language, the literature, the life and the art of ancient Greece and ancient Rome, whether actually engaged in teaching the Classics or not, are eligible to membership in the Association. Application for membership may be made to the Secretary-Treasurer, Charles Knapp, Barnard College, New York. The annual dues (which cover also the subscription to THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY) are two dollars. Within the territory covered by the Association (New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia) subscription is possible to individuals only through membership in The Classical Association of the Atlantic States. To institutions in this territory the subscription price is one dollar per year. Outside the territory of the Association the subscription price of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is one dollar per year. If affidavit to bill for subscription is required, the fee must be paid by the subscriber. Subscribers in Canada or other foreign countries must send 30 cents extra for postage.

Managing Editor

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College, Columbia University

Associate Editors

WALTER DENNISON, Swarthmore College
WALTON B. McDANIEL, University of Pennsylvania
DAVID M. ROBINSON, The Johns Hopkins University
B. L. ULLMAN, University of Pittsburgh
H. H. YEAMES, Hobart College

Communications, articles, reviews, books for review, queries, etc., inquiries concerning subscriptions and advertising, back numbers or extra numbers, notices of change of address, etc., should be sent to Charles Knapp, Barnard College, New York City.

Single copies, 10 cents. Extra numbers, 10 cents each, \$1.00 per dozen.

Printed by W. F. Humphrey, 300 Pulteney St., Geneva, N. Y.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE ATLANTIC STATES

Organized in November, 1906
Membership April 30, 1916—725

Dues \$2.00 per annum
(The year runs from May 1 to April 30)

President

PROFESSOR CHARLES E. BENNETT,
Cornell University

Secretary-Treasurer

PROFESSOR CHARLES KNAPP,
Barnard College, New York City

Vice-Presidents

Professor Harold L. Cleasby, Syracuse University.
Professor Catharine Saunders, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Mr. W. W. King, Barringer High School, Newark, N. J.
Miss Jessie E. Allen, Girls' High School, Philadelphia, Pa.
Professor Evan T. Sage, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Professor Elisha Conover, Delaware College, Newark, Del.
Miss Mary B. Rockwood, Western High School, Baltimore, Md.
Professor Charles S. Smith, George Washington University, D. of C.

"I should as soon think of swimming across the Charles River when I wish to go to Boston, as of reading all my books in originals, when I have them rendered for me in my mother-tongue"—EMERSON.

The Oxford Library of Translations

The Parallel Psalter.	Horace.
Hesiod.	Virgil.
Plato's Socratic Dialogues.	Tacitus' Histories and Minor Works, 3 vols.
Plato's Republic, 2 vols.	Statius' Silvae.
Demosthenes' Orations, 2 vols.	Apuleius' Apologia and Florida.
Aristotle's Politics.	Apuleius' Metamorphoses, 2 vols.
Plutarch, Selected Essays.	Alfred's Boethius.
Lucian, 4 vols.	Beowulf.
Longinus.	St. Bernard on Consideration.
Marcus Aurelius.	Dante's Divina Commedia.
Philostratus, 2 vols.	Dante's Convivio.
The Life of Porphyry.	Machiavelli's Prince.
Lucretius.	Heine's Buch der Lieder.
Caesar's Gallic War and Civil War, 2 vols.	
Propertius.	

Uniform Green Cloth Binding. Per Volume, \$1.00

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS AMERICAN BRANCH
35 West 32nd Street New York

SPECIAL PUBLICATIONS BY

The Classical Association of the
Atlantic States

(1) A PAMPHLET OF 40 PAGES (exclusive of the covers) ENTITLED

The Practical Value of Latin

Expressions by lawyers, physicians, journalists, engineers, scientists, educators and business men favorable to the Classics, as subjects having a direct meaning and use for those who plan to engage in various forms of so-called practical life. A pamphlet suitable for distribution among High School or preparatory School pupils and among College students as well.

12 COPIES	\$.50	100 COPIES	\$3.50
25 "	1.00	160 "	5.00
50 "	1.90	Larger quantities may be had at even lower rates	

(2) The Teaching of English
and the

Study of the Classics

By PROFESSOR LANE COOPER

Reprinted from *The Classical Weekly*, 8, 178-182, as a 16-page pamphlet; deserves wide distribution among both friends and foes of the Classics.

12 COPIES	\$.25	60 COPIES	\$1.00
25 "	.50	100 "	1.50

Larger quantities may be had at even lower rates

ADDRESS

CHARLES KNAPP Barnard College
New York City